

CITIES OF OREM AND PROVO
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
56 North State Street, Orem, Utah
April 17, 2014

This meeting was for discussion purposes only. No action was taken.

CONDUCTING	Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr. and Councilmember Mark E. Seastrand
OREM ELECTED OFFICIALS	Mayor Richard F. Brunst, Jr. and Councilmembers Margaret Black, Tom Macdonald, Mark E. Seastrand, and David Spencer
PROVO ELECTED OFFICIALS	Mayor John Curtis and Provo Councilmembers Gary Garrett, Hal Miller, Kim Santiago, Dave Sewell, and Gary Winterton,
OREM STAFF	Jamie Davidson, City Manager; Brenn Bybee, Assistant City Manager; Steven Downs, Assistant to the City Manager; and Taraleigh Gray, Deputy City Recorder
PROVO STAFF	Wayne Parker, Chief Administrative Officer and Matt Taylor, Council Director
EXCUSED	Orem Councilmembers Hans Andersen and Brent Sumner

Call to Order

Mayor Brunst called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

Mr. Macdonald provided a blessing on the meal.

Items of Common Interest

State Street Master Plan

Mayor Brunst asked Mayor Curtis to explain Provo's intent in being involved in the State Street Study. Mayor Curtis indicated the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) considered proposals of what they would help fund. Orem submitted a proposal requesting assistance for a State Street study. When that was proposed, Provo requested to tag along for the transportation portion of it. He suggested the need to look at the entire State Street corridor that runs between the two cities. Orem was willing to match a portion that MAG was not funding, and Provo would be responsible for a portion of that, as well, since the study affected both cities.

Mr. Davidson said Orem was in the process of modifying the RFP. The City of Orem has had conversations to determine the scope of the involvement with the RFP. The essential goal was to determine an individual vision.

Mr. Seastrand asked how far this would go. Mr. Davidson said it would go at least to Bulldog Boulevard in Provo.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Mayor Brunst indicated Orem wanted to lend support to the BRT process and asked Provo to provide an update.

Matt Taylor, Provo Council Director, said the project was moving forward, and in the meantime a local transit engineering firm was considering a number of issues through the project. An initial report was due by April 25th, with a final report in place by May 6, 2014. Provo was prepared for the firm to provide some possibilities in achieving greater ridership on the bus line, and ways to improve efficiencies.

Mayor Brunst said this was a very important topic and the timing was right to discuss the issue. Years could go by before another opportunity of this likeness would come again.

Mr. Seastrand asked from a timeframe stand point when the funding would be available, and if there was a timeframe in order to secure the funding.

Kim Santiago addressed Mr. Seastrand's query by saying the federal funds were available at that time but may not be available later. The funding had to be in place by August, 2014.

Mayor Brunst said the local funding was similar in that the funds were available then, but may not be available if the project was put off.

Mrs. Santiago said an independent firm, Hale Civil Science, wanted to see this project work and wanted to answer questions regarding ridership composition. It was considering subsidized passes for UVU students who want a straight shot to the UVU campus. BYU was modeled as one transportation zone, and metro is splitting this into several zones. The firm was looking into learning what the ridership was at BYU and where it was coming from. The firm was not tied by any specific interest in the method by which the project was completed. The important first step was to get the funding and have a system in place to secure it.

Mr. Davidson said there were a number of moving parts to this discussion. The efforts of on the part of UDOT were one of them. There were question marks based on discussions on transit and greater mobility problems with how it might improve or impact traffic in Orem.

Mrs. Black asked if an independent firm was being used to analyze the project.

Mrs. Santiago said it was difficult to find a truly independent firm that had not done projects for UTA or UDOT. This group performed a study for the transportation master plan in Provo. Choosing this firm was an effort to make sure what was being done was efficient and fast, and that the result gave a true gauge on the ridership of the bus lines. The reputation of this firm was central in the fact that it could go toe-to-toe and stand by their work. Provo was drawn to working with this firm because they were in a position to stand behind what they found.

UTOPIA

Mayor Brunst gave an update on the UTOPIA process and allowed Provo to update Orem on the happenings with Provo's involvement with Google Fiber.

Mayor Curtis said it was the one-year anniversary of the Google Fiber announcement. Google Fiber went through three of the seven defined neighborhoods in the city. The approach to outfitting Provo with Google fiber has been both aerial and underground, which was dependent upon where the power poles and existing infrastructure was. Google Fiber started in one neighborhood and has perfected the installation approach as progress was made throughout the city. Google has not shared the exact take rates with Provo administrators, but Google has proven to be good partners to work with through the process.

Mayor Curtis said Provo has learned that the product Google was providing was more of a residential product than a commercial product. A test beta commercial product was launched in Kansas City.

Mayor Brunst asked if Provo had any idea of what products are being purchased.

Mayor Curtis reiterated that no information was being provided, but Provo understood the utilized services varied by neighborhood.

Mayor Brunst said he spoke to Comcast whose capacity was doubling due to the newfound ability to compress bandwidth on coax cables. Comcast was displaying lower prices and was going after more residential customers. Mayor Brunst reported Century Link was going after more businesses in Orem and Salt Lake City by laying its own fiber. ISP competitors were stepping up service capabilities.

Mrs. Black wondered what would happen if it weren't for iProvo and UTOPIA. The observed success has been because of prior endeavors involving the laying of infrastructure.

Mayor Curtis left the discussion at 12:48 p.m.

Mayor Brunst said money spent in Orem on Comcast Triple Play services and on cell ran approximately \$4 million per month.

Interlocal Ethics Commission

Mr. Sewell indicated Provo was in an awkward position due a situation concerning a former council member. Mr. Sewell said he understood Orem had entered – or was considering entering – an interlocal ethics commission and sought Mayor Brunst's perspective on the pros and cons of doing so.

Mr. Macdonald requested Provo to explain its decision to not participate in the interlocal commission.

Mr. Sewell said Provo had recently formed a committee within their city before learning of the State's intent to form an interlocal ethics commission. He said Provo struggled to come out of that difficult situation and the timing of the experience made it difficult to jump on to the new legislation.

Instead, Provo took the time to cool off which allowed the Council to step back and tactfully address concerns.

Mr. Macdonald gathered that Provo had not entirely ruled out joining the interlocal commission.

Mr. Davidson said joining the interlocal commission was appealing to Orem. He said there was value in having people who understood this area to be party to this type of assessment and review. There were benefits from looking at it from a local control perspective rather than on a state level due to the differing needs between the two levels. Local control provided opportunity to set a time table which was not subject to the State. Mr. Davidson said he did not foresee any additional cost would be incurred with the choice to become part of the interlocal commission. In sum, cost, speed, and local control were key reasons why Orem was looking at joining the interlocal commission.

Mr. Taylor asked if it pertained to more than a convenient way to identify an independent council in matters of municipal government.

Mr. Davidson said the purpose was to serve as a review body for elected officials. The responsibility of the body would be limited and the framework would be defined by the State's ethics ordinance. Mr. Davidson likened it to a mutual aid type of agreement.

Mr. Macdonald said it was similar to municipalities sharing fire department resources.

Mr. Davidson explained that the process would be such that a body would be seated and once that body had served they would be removed from the commission for a time in order to not place undue burden on one municipality or another.

Mr. Macdonald said the Orem city attorneys were looking into Orem's participation.

Mr. Davidson understood it was a raw issue for Provo and it was best to let time pass and let wounds heal.

Mr. Taylor said the reason Provo sought independent review was due to a document generated by its own Council. The question arose as to where the Council would turn for service in reviewing it.

Mr. Davidson said the intent was to move forward in a timely manner within relative cost.

Mr. Davidson went on to share appreciation for Provo's fire department in providing their services in fighting the fire at Vivint. He thanked Provo for the reciprocity in providing agency services in times of need and appreciated the fact that the cities could work together to protect property and life.

Mayor Brunst left the discussion at 1:02 p.m.

Citizen Commissions and Committees

Mr. Seastrand said he found the joint meetings very valuable to find ways to work together and develop concepts. He asked if there were any other topics to address.

Mrs. Santiago asked how Orem City Council utilized citizen-led committees and if Orem gave these committees/commissions a budget to work from.

Mr. Seastrand said some of the commissions and committees were appointed by the City Manager and others were appointed by the City Council. Mr. Seastrand named the Transportation Advisory Commission as one which has been very active and beneficial to the City.

Mr. Macdonald left the discussion at 1:05 p.m.

Mr. Davidson said it was important that committees were put together with a substance – without substance or purpose, the committees tended to lose momentum. The division of committees had also led to invalidating original committees, so the City was mindful of this. Some committees were easy to fill while others had proven more difficult.

Mrs. Santiago asked how the volunteerism was organized in Orem.

Mrs. Black said information was available on the web. Mr. Davidson said there is a designated volunteer coordinator in Orem's Public Works department.

Mr. Winterton asked if committees were generated through administration or by the City Council.

Mr. Davidson said there were many means to submit names and the Council and Mayor recommended names as well. Orem was working through the creation of a more formal application process to learn motivation and willingness to serve.

Mrs. Black cautioned about the "good-old-boy" network and said Orem was trying to address the potential issues by providing everyone the opportunity to apply to serve within the City.

Mr. Seastrand said Orem wanted people from all different parts of the City to serve. Recommendations for service also came from people leaving service terms.

Mrs. Black said, with regard to budget, that some committees are not given any budget whatsoever, and used the Summerfest committee as an example. The volunteers achieved a lot even without having a set amount of money to do it.

Set Date and Time for Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for July 17, 2014, at noon in Provo.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Donna R. Weaver, City Recorder

Approved: April 29, 2014